

# **North American Animal Liberation Press Office Newsletter**

**Volume One Number Two**

# Table of Contents

## News

- 3 Lab monkeys 'scream with fear' in tests
- 4 The Hidden World of Animal Research
- 9 'McLibel' pair win legal aid case
- 10 Whistleblower Charges Louisiana Chimp Lab with Cruelty
- 11 Animal Experiments Misled Scientists on COX-2 Drugs
- 12 PCRM Develops World's First Cruelty-Free Insulin Assay
- 13 Scientists say they often censor themselves to avoid controversy
- 15 Of mice, men and medical concern
- 16 Animal testing laws 'not enforced'
- 17 U.S. Scientists Say They Are Told to Alter Findings
- 19 NIH to Investigate Animal Cruelty Charges Against Ohio State University
- 20 New Virus May Have Come from Monkeys, Experts Say
- 21 Animal Rights Advocacy Is a Growing Field
- 23 The Secret Life of Moody Cows
- 24 Animals make poor guinea pigs in drugs tests
- 25 When Medicine And Money Don't Mix: Do drugmakers have too much control over lab data?

## Featured Article

- 28 The New Abolitionism: Capitalism, Slavery and Animal Liberation

## Lab monkeys 'scream with fear' in tests

Sandra Laville

Tuesday February 8, 2005

The Guardian

Secret documents describing how some monkeys can scream in misery, fear and anger during experiments were produced in the high court yesterday as evidence that the laws intended to protect laboratory animals are being flouted.

Excerpts from Cambridge University internal papers - one of several sites where primate research is carried out - give laboratory technicians and scientists advice on how to deal with problems during and after experiments. Presented in court by the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), they describe occasions when primates are "screaming, trying to get out of the box, defecating", and state: "This is an angry animal."

Scientists and technicians are advised in the documents to "punish" the bad habits of the monkeys, stating that these bad habits include the normal self-grooming.

Richard Drabble QC, for the BUAV, told the high court yesterday that the documents contradict the general public perception that animals are well cared for and protected under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

Making an application for judicial review of the legality of lab practices, he also alleged that brain-damaged monkeys at Cambridge were not provided with the 24-hour veterinary care which the government's own guidance states is necessary.

David Thomas, the solicitor for BUAV, said: "Cambridge staff work 9-5pm, so animals who had just been brain damaged were left overnight without veterinary attention.

"Some were found to be dead in the morning, some were found to be in a worse condition. Yet there is an obligation of licence holders to keep suffering to a minimum. The whole system is very secretive and the public does not get to see what is really going on."

The court challenge comes after the government's chief inspector of animals dismissed the findings of a 10-month undercover investigation by BUAV into three research programmes at Cambridge in 1998. BUAV claimed they discovered monkeys which had the tops of their heads sawn off in order for a stroke to be induced and were then left for 15 hours without veterinary attention.

But the court heard that after reviewing the licence to Cambridge for the three programmes, and some of the other 4,000 testing licences granted in England and Wales, the chief inspector of animals gave a clean bill of health to all establishments.

For the home secretary, Jonathan Swift said the application for a judicial review should be dismissed. He said the chief inspector of animals had concluded that the decisions taken each time the licences were granted had been sound and the home secretary had accepted these findings.

Mr Swift said the granting of licences was case-specific and highly fact-sensitive. The home secretary had to "weigh the likely adverse effects on the animals concerned against the benefit likely to accrue as a result of the programme".

The three programmes Cambridge was carrying out involved research into degenerative brain diseases such as Parkinson's and Alzheimer's.

---

## **The Hidden World of Animal Research: A Hidden World Working behind a self-imposed, legally debatable cloak of secrecy, CU's Health Sciences Center withholds from the public virtually all information about its animal-research programs.**

By Clay Evans, Daily Camera Staff Writer

December 5, 2004

If you had to pick a terrorist out of a police lineup, Rita Anderson would surely be the least likely candidate. The 58-year-old grandmother and Gunbarrel resident laughs frequently, is magnanimous and polite even with adversaries, and if she's prideful about anything, it's her children, grandchildren and pets.

But because of her tireless, non-violent work as an animal advocate — including an effort that helped persuade the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center to stop performing surgery on live dogs for its physiology courses — some find her irritating, perhaps even dangerous.

"Ms. Anderson supports PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals), and PETA supports the legal defense of individuals in the ALF (Animal Liberation Front) who have committed crimes," says Dr. John Sladek, vice chancellor for research at the Health Sciences Center. "And we can't assume that (terrorism) won't happen here."

Anderson, who since last year has focused her efforts on winning the release of a small colony of bonnet macaque monkeys at the Health Sciences Center, is amused that she is viewed by anyone as a threat, and notes that she has no connection to PETA.

"To put me in the category of a terrorist, as somebody who would do something violent, is absurd," she says. "I want things to be ethical and nonviolent. ... I have concerns for the lives of the animals."

Anderson may annoy the powers that be at the Health Sciences Center with her persistent requests for documents and occasional peaceful demonstrations — but if she weren't looking out for the welfare of animal research subjects, these days it's not clear who else would.

Like all other institutions that use animals for research, the Health Sciences Center is required by the federal Animal Welfare Act to appoint an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, or IACUC, to ensure the ethical treatment of animal subjects, approve research protocols and inspect animal facilities, among many other duties. But also like many institutions, the Health Sciences Center has shrouded its IACUC in secrecy, refusing public attendance at meetings, withholding even the identities of committee members and censoring virtually all information about animal research from public documents.

Sladek and others argue that the IACUC is essentially exempt from Colorado open-records and open-meetings laws, because of alleged threats from activists: "I would rather resign my position than reveal our IACUC members," Sladek says.

"I'm amazed that the public accepts the secrecy," says Dr. Christopher Kuni, one of the chairs of the Health Sciences Center's analogous board governing treatment of human subjects, the Institutional Review Board.

But former IACUC members and staff — all of whom requested anonymity, because they still work in biomedical research and fear retaliation — say that Sladek and other administrators have used that veil of secrecy to conceal actions in violation of widely accepted ethics regarding animal use, including: keeping the macaque colony, even when the animals were not being used for research, and using public money to maintain it; a plan to breed the monkeys and sell the embryos to outside institutions, for revenue, not research; firing a well-respected veterinarian and dumping IACUC members who raised objections to those plans; and failing to adhere to a U.S. Department of Agriculture timeline to move the monkeys from a facility deemed to be "in poor condition."

"I can't understand what the hell got into these people," one former IACUC member said. "They had an exemplary program. Then the whole thing went to hell in a handbasket."

The story begins with the small colony of macaques, used by researcher Mark Laudenslager in "maternal separation" experiments since 1986. With Laudenslager's National Institutes of Health grant slated to expire, his active monkey research ceased in October 2003.

That's when Anderson began urging the school to release the monkeys to a sanctuary. During a Denver visit, famed primate researcher Jane Goodall seconded Anderson's notion.

But Sladek sent Anderson a letter indicating that the Health Sciences Center would be willing to release the monkeys only if the school received an estimated \$10,000 to \$15,000 per monkey (there were 34 at the time) to replace them.

Some think that's outrageous.

The monkeys "were part of federally funded research. ... CU is now holding them ransom when they have never paid a dime for their upkeep," says a former IACUC member.

Sladek says the figure he cited has been misunderstood.

"It's been described as a demand on our part, which it never was," he said during a Sept. 9 interview at the Health Sciences Center's new Fitzsimons campus. "It was just realistic: If we were to release the colony and replace it ... that is approximately what the (new) animals would cost."

Yet former IACUC members say that an "exit strategy" for the monkeys was an explicit condition under which Laudenslager's research was approved by the IACUC in early 2002. IACUC minutes support that contention.

"The primates are not euthanized at the end of these studies. Previously primates that were no longer used on studies were sold or transferred to other investigators. At the present time, there is no market for these animals," read the minutes from the Nov. 12, 2001, IACUC meeting.

The IACUC was primarily concerned that the institution not have to pay to keep monkeys that were not being used in research. It approved Laudenslager's protocol on Jan. 14, 2002, only after receiving assurances that the monkeys would be transferred to a research facility in California when his research ended.

Despite that, the monkeys were kept by the Health Sciences Center — and even bred — between the time Laudenslager's grant ran out, in January, and July, when he obtained a new one. Laudenslager himself sent a series of increasingly frantic e-mails to the National Institutes of Health from January to July, begging for money.

"(A)t the end of the current fiscal year, there will be no finds (sic) to cover these monkey's (sic) per diems and the university will be forced to put them up for sale," he wrote on June 14.

Laudenslager also wrote that, "The vice chancellor's office (John Sladek) has covered the per diem expenses for an extended period of time (over a year)."

Asked if the university had paid to support the monkeys at any time, Sladek said he thought Laudenslager's "new grant" had been awarded in late winter or early spring — in fact, it wasn't until July — and that there was therefore no "gap" in funding.

But records indicate otherwise. And that makes some IACUC members who approved the Laudenslager protocol angry.

"We didn't want to approve the protocol until it was clear what the ultimate dispensation of the monkeys was going to be," says one. "At the time, I'd have rather they been euthanized humanely than allowed to live on forever doing research experiments."

So why violate your own rules to keep such a relatively small colony of macaques on hand? Both Sladek and Health Sciences Center spokeswoman Sarah Ellis told the Daily Camera that the monkeys were a "magnet" for further grant money.

But some former IACUC members argue that Health Sciences Center administrators have an even more mercenary goal in mind: Breeding the monkeys, not for research, but so the Health Sciences Center can sell embryos to other institutions and raise money.

In April, May and June 2003, the IACUC mulled over, and finally rejected "protocol #67003703" — also known as the "Sladek protocol," after its principal investigator — because the committee was unable to discern a "research element."

Sladek says the research element was there for all to see: "The research involved the use of embryonic tissue ... used to replace cells lost to Parkinson's disease" in a colony of older bonnet macaques in at the Chicago Medical School, on a project where Sladek is listed as a co-investigator.

However, four people involved with rejecting the Sladek protocol say that it also included a proposal to breed the macaques and sell embryos for stem-cell research, to financially support the colony.

"I was assigned to review the protocol. It was to create embryos for sale," says one former IACUC member. "I had some concerns about just creating (embryos) for sale, so I asked questions: What is the use going to be, how many are we talking about? Are we just trying to make money for the research program? All we were looking for was scientific justification."

But neither the IACUC, nor then-staff veterinarian Ron Banks, could tease out any such justification.

"The Sladek protocol came out of the blue ... and it struck me as kind of weird," says a former IACUC member. "I thought, 'Oh my God, are we now going into the monkey embryo business?' Was this something we really wanted to be doing? I did not think this was a good idea."

A bad idea, if for no other reason than public relations: If the Health Sciences Center became known as a place where monkeys were kept, caged and bred primarily for money, not the advancement of science or human health, the school would no doubt become a target for vigorous protests. But more importantly, IACUC members felt the benefit — money for the school — wasn't worth putting the monkeys through repeated breeding and what amounts to surgical abortion.

Sladek denies that he intended to turn the Health Sciences Center into an embryo factory: "Oh, God, no. That's a total misconception."

The Health Sciences Center legal office extensively censored the IACUC minutes from April, May and June 2003 meetings, at which the Sladek protocol was discussed. Sladek says he "wouldn't have a problem with the public knowing the details," but refused to show uncensored copies of the minutes or the protocol itself to the Daily Camera. He also sent e-mails to Health Sciences Center employees warning them against cooperating with reporters.

In fact, Chancellor James Shore — who last month announced that he is resigning — told CU Regent Jim Martin that he could not have uncensored minutes, even though the regents were scheduled to discuss issues surrounding the monkey colony at their Dec. 8-9 meetings. (Regents' chair Tom Lucero took the item off the published agenda last week, citing a need to address issues surrounding the CU-Boulder Athletic Department. He told Anderson that the issue would be placed back on the agenda in the next month or two.)

"Nothing undermines the confidence in a public institution more than a failure to produce evidence or documents that are requested by the public," Martin says. "On issues like (animal research), reasonable people can disagree. But if one side refuses to provide the information necessary to have a meaningful discussion, that's not good-faith communication."

So why all the secrecy, if the protocol is as innocent as described, given that Sladek has been very public about his work with monkey embryos and stem cells? It's not animal advocates he's worried about, he says, but people opposed to human abortion and stem-cell research.

Meanwhile, the flaps over the Laudenslager and Sladek protocols allowed Sladek to retool a previously recalcitrant IACUC. He refused to reappoint a dissenting member and fired Banks shortly after his protocol was denied (the USDA is currently investigating alleged violations of the Animal Welfare Act surrounding Banks' firing) which inspired several IACUC members to resign.

"The credibility, independence, and neutrality of the IACUC are critical to the university's standing among government agencies ..., private citizens, and investigators both here and at other institutions," wrote former member Ethan Carter in a Sept. 10, 2003, resignation letter to Sladek. "Your actions have undermined the very foundation of the committee on all of these fronts."

Laudenslager's new grant money finally arrived in July, paving the way for research into the way alcohol use may determine aggressive or impulsive behavior among macaques.

Not everybody considers it vital research.

"Some 60 years of offering alcohol to animals has produced no fundamental insights into the causes of this self-destructive behavior (in humans), or even a convincing analogue of pathological drinking," says Vincent P. Dole of the Laboratory of the Biology of the Addictive Diseases at New York's Rockefeller University.

As for Sladek's work, he won't say whether the reconstituted IACUC approved a new version of his once-rejected protocol. But he acknowledges that the macaques were taken off birth control in January and have been breeding since.

Which presumably means that the Health Sciences Center, having ignored previous protocols, will keep the macaques at least until Laudenslager's current grant runs out in May 2009. But just where they will live remains to be seen.

The current primate facility was found to be "in poor condition" and had problems "maintaining appropriate temperatures" for tropical macaques, according to a U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service report dated July 29, 2003.

In response, the Health Sciences Center came up with a plan to move the monkeys to an existing building on the Fitzsimons campus. In a Nov. 21, 2003 letter, R. Ridenour, DVM of the USDA/APHIS Western Region gave the Health Sciences Center "until October 1, 2004, to complete your planned renovations of, and relocating animals into" that building. The letter advised Sladek that, "Should complications arise that may interfere with your ability to meet this timeline, please contact us immediately."

Health Sciences Center spokeswoman Sarah Ellis denied a reporter's August request to tour the new, as-yet-unoccupied facility, because the school didn't want to tip off animal-rights "terrorists" — her word — to its location. (Ellis says she doesn't "know specifically of threats," but says that Laudenslager and other researchers had received "death threats" by phone.)

But in a Sept. 9 interview, Sladek and Ellis gave a very different story: There is no new facility to tour. Sladek pointed at a vacant lot on the Fitzsimons campus where a primate vivarium is expected to be built by 2008. In the meantime, the school plans to move rodents out of facilities at Ninth Street and Colorado Avenue in Denver, and renovate them for primate use. Sladek said "I hope" the monkeys will be moved by December.

Asked if he had notified the USDA of the change in plans, Sladek said, "We will advise USDA that the plan has been delayed and modified." He sent a letter dated Sept. 30 — one day before a deadline set in 2003 — indicating that "Complications have arisen," and asking for an extension to Jan. 1, 2005.

The fate of three dozen research monkeys — an admittedly small colony — may not concern many people. But the extreme secrecy around CU's animal research should.

From within its self-imposed, legally debatable cloak of secrecy, the Health Sciences Center has cut the public off from virtually all information about its animal research programs.

Do the people of Colorado want the Health Sciences Center to maintain a perpetual "boutique" colony of small primates for the sole purpose of keeping a single researcher in grant money, or as "embryo factories" whose oddly circular purpose is to provide for the keeping of monkeys?

They may, or they may not. But for now, administrators at Colorado's only comprehensive medical university aren't even willing to engage them in the conversation. Instead, they have drawn a curtain around all animal research, rid themselves of dissenters, and announced that it's nobody's business but their own.

And Rita Anderson says that's not right. Health Sciences Center officials can tar her with whatever label they want, she says, but somebody has to look out for the animals.

"I simply want to obtain the release of the monkeys through legal, ethical means," she says. "I have been up front with (Health Sciences Center officials), and I would appreciate their being up front with me."

---

## **'McLibel' pair win legal aid case: Two activists should have been given legal aid in their long fight against a McDonald's libel action, a court says.**

Story from BBC NEWS:

Published: 2005/02/15 18:00:20 GMT

The European Court of Human Rights said the lack of such aid effectively denied the pair the right to a fair trial.

Helen Steel and David Morris, from north London, dubbed the "McLibel Two", were found guilty in a 1990s trial of libelling the company in a leaflet.

England's libel laws may now be changed, although legal aid is now sometimes available in libel cases.

### **Libellous leaflets**

The original legal wrangle - the longest civil or criminal action in English legal history - was triggered when McDonald's sued former gardener Helen Steel, 39, and former postman David Morris, 50.

The pair had been handing out leaflets containing numerous allegations about the corporation's policies and practices.

Neither Ms Steel nor Mr Morris wrote the leaflets, but became embroiled in the libel action launched in 1990 and ending only in 1997 - with of 314 days spent in court.

At the end of the case the High Court ruled McDonald's had been libelled and awarded the company £60,000 in damages, later reduced to £40,000 on appeal. But he found the leaflet was true in some aspects.

The Strasbourg court's verdict is the end of a subsequent courtroom fight in which the activists accused the UK Government of breaching their human rights.

"We believe there's an alternative where people and communities have control over decision-making and resources" - David Morris

The court ruled they did not receive a fair trial as guaranteed under the Human Rights Convention, because of the lack of legal aid available to libel defendants, and that their freedom of expression was violated by the 1997 judgement.

The pair were awarded £24,000 damages, plus costs.

Reacting to Tuesday's decision, a spokesman for the Department of Constitutional Affairs said: "We are studying the judgement very carefully."

Recent changes in the law mean that legal aid is now sometimes available in exceptional libel cases.

### **Legal repercussions**

Libel lawyer Jeremy Clarke-Williams said the government would look at the libel laws in the wake of the decision "but I would be surprised if there were any changes as a result".

He said the situation had changed since the case emerged in the 1990s.

The cutback in legal aid and emergence of "no win no fee" agreements between lawyers and their clients had largely plugged the hole in provision which led to the action, he said.

Joshua Rozenberg, legal editor of the Daily Telegraph, said: "I think the government will have to make legal aid available to people accused of libel who can't otherwise defend themselves.

"Although the so-called 'McLibel' case came to court in 1994, the allegations related to practices in the 80s" - McDonald's

"The courts will not be able to order individual defendants to pay heavy damages to large corporations."

Celebrating the decision outside a London McDonald's, Mr Morris said: "We believe in people power and we believe people should make the decisions themselves in their own communities."

Ms Steel described the 15-year case as a "complete nightmare" but said it had been good to fight it.

"Hopefully the government will be forced to change the law and that will mean greater freedom of speech," she said.

McDonald's said it would not comment as it was not a party to the case. It said the libel trial related to practices in the 1980s and McDonald's had 'moved on' since then.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/uk/4266209.stm>

© BBC MMV

---

## **Whistleblower Charges Louisiana Chimp Lab with Cruelty**

### **20-Year Research Veteran Files Lawsuit Alleging Illegal Retaliation, Numerous Animal Welfare and Employee Safety Violations**

New Iberia, LA (February 14, 2005) -- A 20-year animal research veteran has filed a lawsuit against the New Iberia Research Center (NIRC) -- the world's largest chimpanzee lab with over 6,000 chimps and monkeys -- asserting illegal retaliation from NIRC after she blew the whistle on alleged animal welfare and employee safety violations, In Defense of Animals (IDA) announced today.

The lawsuit, filed on behalf of Narriman Fakier by attorney L. Clayton Burgess (337-234-7573), asserts numerous violations of federal animal welfare laws as well as potential criminal animal cruelty. The suit alleges that NIRC fired Ms. Fakier for whistleblowing, thus depriving her of her free speech rights. A copy of the suit is available at <http://newiberia.vivisectioninfo.org/NewIberiaWhistleblowerLawsuit.pdf>

The suit states that Ms. Fakier was fired after protesting a plan to place ten toddler chimpanzees in isolation while they were experimented upon. She also objected to the use of a chimpanzee who had never recovered from prior research in a new study that ended up killing him, and raised questions about the deaths of monkeys from exposure due to insufficient heating in their outdoor enclosures. Ms. Fakier was shocked when chimpanzees were deliberately burned with a cigarette lighter and scalded with hot water. According to the suit, NIRC Director Thomas J. Rowell, DVM told Ms. Fakier that if she didn't like the way NIRC operated, she should quit.

These allegations of reprehensible cruelty are shocking but unfortunately not a surprise, said IDA president Elliot Katz, DVM. Negligence, abuse and profound suffering seem to be inherent in the secretive world of federally funded chimpanzee research.

Katz recalled the ten-year controversy over the federally supported Coulston Foundation in New Mexico, in which dozens of chimpanzees died in a lab that was formally charged four times by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for rampant Animal Welfare Act (AWA) violations. He also pointed to the pending criminal animal cruelty charges against Charles River Laboratories, the federal contractor operating the Alamogordo Primate Facility (APF), a chimpanzee lab in New Mexico owned by the National Institutes of Health; see <http://NIHchimpanzecruelty.com>

NIRC Director Thomas J. Rowell also sits on the advisory committee that oversees Charles Rivers operation of the APF.

Fakier's suit also alleges that NIRC violated the whistleblower protection provision of the AWA. According to the lawsuit, the USDA, which enforces the AWA, has opened an official investigation into Ms. Fakier's claims. IDA said that it will press the USDA for a full investigation of the matter, and reiterated its call for a permanent ban on chimpanzee experimentation.

We applaud Ms. Fakier's courage in exposing the cruelty of chimpanzee research, Katz concluded.

IDA is an international animal advocacy and rescue organization based in Mill Valley, CA. The group's investigations have made history by leading to the criminal animal cruelty charges filed against Charles River Laboratories in September 2004 as well as the closure of The Coulston Foundation primate testing lab in 2002.

---

## **Animal Experiments Misled Scientists on COX-2 Drugs**

On February 17, John J. Pippin, M.D., F.A.C.C., will testify before Food and Drug Administration (FDA) officials and present a new report detailing how experiments on mice, dogs, and other animals misled scientists and ultimately contributed to a tragic outcome for human patients exposed to Vioxx and other drugs. Dr. Pippin will represent the nonprofit Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM).

PCRM's report reveals that Vioxx and other COX-2 drugs actually had a heart-protective effect in mice and other animals, exactly opposite of how the drugs later performed in humans. The report also reveals that once clinical trials started showing that the drugs caused heart problems in humans, the pharmaceutical companies ignored this information and instead pointed to the animal tests as "evidence" that the drugs were safe. As Dr. Pippin illustrates in the report, the Vioxx animal testing debacle is not

unique. Over the years, millions of patients have been exposed to harmful drugs, such as Rezulin and Baycol, that seemed safe in tests on mice, dogs, rats, monkeys, horses, and other animals.

"Reliance on animal tests enabled the FDA to approve Vioxx," says Dr. Pippin. "It is time to turn to newer, more reliable human-based methods such as studying drug metabolism using human liver subcellular fractions." Liver toxicity is the major reason for drug re-labeling and withdrawal, and it often does not show up in dogs and other animals.

Founded in 1985, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine is a nonprofit health organization that promotes preventive medicine, especially good nutrition. PCRM also conducts clinical research studies, opposes unethical human experimentation, and promotes alternatives to animal research.

---

## **PCRM Develops World's First Cruelty-Free Insulin Assay**

If you're an organization dedicated to humane alternatives to the use of animals in research and you want to conduct research of your own that requires using animals as part of the testing, what do you do? In the case of the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, you invent your own test.

PCRM president Neal Barnard, M.D., announced today that PCRM has developed the world's first cruelty-free insulin assay, a test used to measure insulin levels in individuals with diabetes. The assay, which uses no animals, was developed as part of PCRM's ongoing clinical trials to test the effects of a low-fat, vegan diet on patients with type 2 diabetes.

"We only had two options available to us when we began our diabetes trials," said Dr. Barnard. "One, we could use test kits with insulin antibodies grown in vivo—literally from cells injected into the abdomens of live mice—or we could use kits containing antibodies produced from cells cultured with fetal calf serum. Neither was acceptable to us."

The answer? Develop an in-vitro, or test-tube, procedure using a synthetic replacement for the fetal calf serum used as a culturing medium in millions of medical tests every year.

After months of painstaking detective work, PCRM research analyst Megha Even, M.S., working with BiosPacific, an Emoryville, California, lab, succeeded in culturing cells using an animal component-free, peptide- and protein-free, media supplement as a replacement for calf serum—basically a synthetic formula with cofactors and trace elements that promote cell growth. Then, in collaboration with Linco Research of St. Charles, Missouri, Even successfully incorporated antibodies grown in the medium into a test kit for human insulin.

A report on the new methodology will be published soon in a peer-reviewed journal in conjunction with Linco. Even will present her findings at the "Experimental Biology 2005" scientific conference in San Diego, April 2-6. The new assay kits are available commercially from Linco.

"We hope that by making the test readily available and competitively priced, researchers and medical labs will use it," said Barnard. "We have proven that if researchers are willing to make the effort, there are effective, humane alternatives to animal-based assays and other testing procedures—alternatives that could help save the lives of millions of people and animals."

There are an estimated 194 million people worldwide with diabetes. More than 15 million Americans suffer from the disease and resulting complications.

For more information, or to arrange an interview with Megha Even (PCRM) or Patricia Facchini (BiosPacific), contact Howard White at 202-686-2210, ext. 339; [hwhite@pcrm.org](mailto:hwhite@pcrm.org). Requests for sales and technical information on the assay kit can be obtained through: [info@lincoresearch.com](mailto:info@lincoresearch.com).

#### RELATED LINKS

- \* Nutrition education for diabetes patients  
<http://www.pcrm.org/resources/education/nutrition/nutrition4.html>
- \* Diet and Diabetes factsheet <http://www.pcrm.org/health/prevmed/diabetes.html>
- \* Ten Delicious Dishes to Help Defeat Diabetes <http://www.pcrm.org/health/reports/diabetes.html>
- \* Diabetes: Can a Vegan Diet Cure Diabetes? By Andrew Nicholson, M.D.  
<http://www.pcrm.org/health/clinres/diabetes.html>

---

## Scientists say they often censor themselves to avoid controversy

February 10, 2005, 2:38 PM

Detroit Free Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Some scientists are thinking twice about doing or reporting on certain research, reacting to political and social controversy in addition to legal restrictions.

"It appears that controversy shapes what scientists choose to study and how they choose to study it, and we need to look a little bit more closely at the effects it might be having," said Joanne Kempner, a researcher at the University of Michigan.

Kempner and co-authors from Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania conducted in-depth interviews with 41 scientists engaged in a variety of studies. They found that half felt constrained by formal limits, but even more said they were affected by informal or unspoken rules on what and how studies can be done. Their findings are reported in Thursday's issue of the journal *Science*, in a paper entitled "Forbidden Knowledge."

Formal limits include such things as the ban on federal funding for most research on embryonic stem cells and restrictions on research involving humans.

In many cases, too, scientific journals have their own rules, such as refusing to publish material they think might be detrimental to national security.

But there also are fears about the ire of interest groups, such as opponents of animal testing, or about how a project would be perceived by the public.

While formal and informal restrictions on research are not unusual, Deborah G. Johnson of the University of Virginia said they are not necessarily all bad,

"On the one hand, you want a profession to have norms and to have some standards and some self-regulation. On the other hand, you don't want there to be an environment of fear of repercussions if they do something which they think is legitimate," said Johnson, who has studied similar issues but was not part of Kempner's group.

One researcher, commenting on avoiding controversial work, told Kempner's team: "I would like to lunatic-proof my life as much as possible."

Another reported deciding not to do a study involving offering food vouchers to drug addicts who tested clean.

"That was something that thought they couldn't do," Kempner said in a telephone interview. "One researcher said, 'Can you imagine that as a headline on the front page of the newspaper, that we're paying cocaine addicts to stay clean?'"

Kempner said, "A lot of researchers that we spoke to were risk-averse in terms of avoiding controversy." But, she added, "There were plenty of people who said controversy is a good thing, because it opens up topics to public debate."

Militant animal rights groups were a concern for many, who worried about organizations that have invaded laboratories to set animals loose and destroy research.

Kempner recalled one of her interviews. "All of a sudden he said, 'How do I know you're not from an animal rights organization collecting information to storm the place?'"

Sometimes commercial interests can get in the way of research, Kempner added, saying there are cases when the pharmaceutical industry will ask a researcher not to publish a particular finding.

Another example was a researcher who wanted to study what kind of environments can lead to sexual harassment. "She couldn't find a company that would let her ask those kinds of questions to employees," Kempner said. They didn't want anything that might give one of their workers the idea to sue.

She also cited the case of an alcohol researcher who felt some studies could not be done in this country, for example, a trial on whether alcoholics could be taught to drink in moderation.

"Those kinds of studies, according to this researcher, couldn't be done in the United States because we live in a culture that believes addicts ... must quit cold turkey," and the work might undermine that position, she said.

And there are cases of self-censorship, Kempner said.

"Sometimes researchers depend on particular groups to give them access to data ... and very often they form attachments and really like what the group is doing. So, if they have a finding that undermines what the group is doing, they wouldn't publish it, some actually haven't published it."

Kempner's research was funded by the Greenwall Foundation and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

---

## Of mice, men and medical concern

Financial Times (London, England)

March 4, 2005 Friday

By ROBERT MATTHEWS

Two huge industries affecting the lives of millions of people are currently subject to big health alerts. Concern over serious side-effects has cast a long shadow over promising new painkillers, known as cox-2 inhibitors, developed by the pharmaceutical industry. Evidence linking the drugs to an increased risk of heart attacks led the US giant Merck to withdraw its version, known as Vioxx, from the market last September, and an investigation by the -US Food and Drug Administration is currently under way.

More recently, it was the turn of the UK food industry, with the discovery of traces of a banned dye known as Sudan I in a sauce made by Premier Foods, a leading UK supplier. In the ensuing health scare, the UK Food Standards Agency found that hundreds of products had been inadvertently contaminated by the dye, which has been linked to cancer.

As the initial furore starts to fade, both these health alerts are being seen primarily as wake-up calls to business and regulators alike about the monitoring of product safety.

In the case of cox-2 inhibitors, the FDA looks set to allow their continued use - albeit with much sterner safety warnings to protect those most at risk from side-effects. Meanwhile, as shops and supermarkets in the UK hunt down produce contaminated with Sudan I, the FSA has continued to stress that the risks involved are "very small".

As well it might, for it is now clear that the scientific case against Sudan I is far from compelling. Laboratory safety tests involved feeding rodents with levels of Sudan I equivalent to human consumption of the sauce that triggered the scare at a rate of three tonnes a day for two years.

Even after such gargantuan exposure, the animals failed to produce consistent evidence of a cancer risk. Other tests hinted at links with bladder and liver tumours - but only after the dye was injected directly into the organs of laboratory animals.

While the scientific basis for both the Sudan I and cox-2 inhibitor health scares may be contentious, they have highlighted the need for close surveillance and prompt action if problems emerge. At the same time, however, an even more fundamental question has gone begging: just how reliable are animal tests of product safety?

In the case of food safety, the relevance to humans of animal tests involving colossal intakes or direct injection into organs is clearly questionable. The use of animals in drug safety testing raises altogether more complex issues, however - as the cox-2 painkillers controversy shows.

In line with standard practice, Vioxx and the other drugs were tested in at least two different types of animal before entering clinical trials with humans. One of the main aims of such "pre-clinical" testing is to detect signs of serious side-effects. In the case of the cox-2 drugs, the animal testing failed to warn of the cardiovascular effects that have prompted the current furore. Indeed, several animal studies suggested the drugs would actually reduce the risk of such side-effects.

So what went wrong? Anti-vivisectionists have been quick to voice their standard objection: animals are not humans.

For all its familiarity, it is an argument that does have relevance to the cox-2 inhibitors. In 2000, barely a year after the launch of Vioxx, a study of more than 8,000 patients suggested that those taking the drug faced a significantly increased risk of heart attack. Yet subsequent animal-based research continued to suggest such drugs could reduce the risk - prompting even Merck's experts to concede in *The American Heart Journal* that: "The relevance of these animal models in predicting effects in humans is uncertain."

It is becoming clear that such uncertainty extends far beyond one class of blockbuster drug.

Leading journal *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* last year published a review of the evidence that animals are reliable predictors of toxic effects in humans. The authors found that the evidence was "fragmentary", with the few published studies pointing to "significant over- and under-prediction of adverse effects from animal studies that varies with the particular organ or system".

The review also highlighted the lack of basic data needed for a scientific assessment of animal testing, such as measures of predictive power and their statistical significance.

As it stands, the evidence suggests animal tests may be unduly sensitive, wrongly predicting toxicity in compounds that are in fact harmless to humans. If so, it would be an ironic twist to the widely held belief that tests of animal are crucial to the advancement of medicine, as they may in fact be blocking the development of many safe and effective new treatments.

Yet in the absence of large-scale studies comparing drug responses in animals and humans, it is impossible to know. Supporters and critics of animal testing continue to trade anecdotes of individual successes and failures, most published studies being so small they lack statistical credibility.

In another irony, the drive to minimise the use of animals has compelled researchers to draw conclusions from meagre evidence. For example, the studies designed to investigate the effect of cox-2 inhibitors on cardiovascular risk typically involved fewer than 20 mice.

The authors of last year's review called on regulatory bodies and drugs companies to publish data currently languishing in their files. Whether the outcome will confirm or confound the view that animals usefully predict human reactions remains to be seen.

What is clear is that, given the paucity of systematic evidence, it is not necessary to be a placard-waving protestor to harbour doubts about the validity of animal testing.

The writer is visiting reader in science at Aston University, Birmingham

<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/9d740c90-8c53-11d9-a895-00000e2511c8.html>

---

## **Animal testing laws 'not enforced'**

Guardian Unlimited

Press Association

Monday February 7, 2005

Secret documents reveal that laws intended to protect laboratory animals are not being properly enforced, anti-vivisection lawyers told the high court today.

Copies of the documents relating to experiments with monkeys were obtained from Cambridge University by the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) during a 10-month undercover investigation.

The BUAV says they contradict the perception held by the general public that animals are well-cared for and protected under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

Undercover investigators discovered monkeys which had the tops of their skulls sawn off. A stroke had been induced, and the animals left unattended for up to 15 hours.

Some monkeys were found dead in the morning after the operation and others were in a poor condition.

BUAV lawyers are asking Mr Justice Stanley Burnton, sitting in London, for permission to challenge the legality of a government decision in 2003 to accept a report by the then-chief inspector of animals, Dr Jon Richmond.

Mr Richmond rejected BUAV claims that the "severity limits" for three licences, granted in 1998 for Cambridge animal experiments, should have been set at "substantial" and not "moderate".

Project licences are supposed to be granted where procedures "cause the least pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm".

Today Richard Drabble QC, acting for the BUAV, said the university's own documents, including one entitled Notes on Shaping Animals, described the problems of marmosets used for experiments being kept in clear plastic boxes.

One referred to the problem of the small monkeys "screaming, trying to get out of the box" and "defecating". The documents also offered solutions for when animals became "miserable" and "angry".

"We say it is crystal clear that the animals' reactions to testing in Perspex boxes do from time to time show a sense of distress. But the chief inspector in his report says 'the standard test method used is not considered to cause pain, stress or lasting harm'. We say that the document plainly envisages that they will get both miserable and angry animals involved in that type of test," Mr Drabble said.

Jonathan Swift, appearing for the Home Office, said the BUAV challenge had been brought too late and in any event was "unarguable". The chief inspector had reached his conclusions on the basis of expert assessment and evaluation, he said.

After today's hearing, the judge invited both sides to make any further submissions to him in writing. He indicated that he hoped to give his ruling within the next few weeks.

---

## **U.S. Scientists Say They Are Told to Alter Findings**

More than 200 Fish and Wildlife researchers cite cases where conclusions were reversed to weaken protections and favor business, a survey finds.

By Julie Cart

The Los Angeles Times

Friday 10 February 2005

More than 200 scientists employed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service say they have been directed to alter official findings to lessen protections for plants and animals, a survey released Wednesday says.

The survey of the agency's scientific staff of 1,400 had a 30% response rate and was conducted jointly by the Union of Concerned Scientists and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility.

A division of the Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service is charged with determining which animals and plants should be placed on the endangered species list and designating areas where such species need to be protected.

More than half of the biologists and other researchers who responded to the survey said they knew of cases in which commercial interests, including timber, grazing, development and energy companies, had applied political pressure to reverse scientific conclusions deemed harmful to their business.

Bush administration officials, including Craig Manson, an assistant secretary of the Interior who oversees the Fish and Wildlife Service, have been critical of the 1973 Endangered Species Act, contending that its implementation has imposed hardships on developers and others while failing to restore healthy populations of wildlife.

Along with Republican leaders in Congress, the administration is pushing to revamp the act. The president's proposed budget calls for a \$3-million reduction in funding of Fish and Wildlife's endangered species programs.

"The pressure to alter scientific reports for political reasons has become pervasive at Fish and Wildlife offices around the country," said Lexi Shultz of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Mitch Snow, a spokesman for the Fish and Wildlife Service, said the agency had no comment on the survey, except to say "some of the basic premises just aren't so."

The two groups that circulated the survey also made available memos from Fish and Wildlife officials that instructed employees not to respond to the survey, even if they did so on their own time. Snow said that agency employees could not use work time to respond to outside surveys.

Fish and Wildlife scientists in 90 national offices were asked 42 questions and given space to respond in essay form in the mail-in survey sent in November.

One scientist working in the Pacific region, which includes California, wrote: "I have been through the reversal of two listing decisions due to political pressure. Science was ignored and worse, manipulated, to build a bogus rationale for reversal of these listing decisions."

More than 20% of survey responders reported they had been "directed to inappropriately exclude or alter technical information."

However, 69% said they had never been given such a directive. And, although more than half of the respondents said they had been ordered to alter findings to lessen protection of species, nearly 40% said they had never been required to do so.

Sally Stefferud, a biologist who retired in 2002 after 20 years with the agency, said Wednesday she was not surprised by the survey results, saying she had been ordered to change a finding on a biological opinion.

"Political pressures influence the outcome of almost all the cases," she said. "As a scientist, I would probably say you really can't trust the science coming out of the agency."

A biologist in Alaska wrote in response to the survey: "It is one thing for the department to dismiss our recommendations, it is quite another to be forced (under veiled threat of removal) to say something that is counter to our best professional judgment."

Don Lindburg, head of the office of giant panda conservation at the Zoological Society of San Diego, said it was unrealistic to expect federal scientists to be exempt from politics or pressure.

"I've not stood in the shoes of any of those scientists," he said. "But it is not difficult for me to believe that there are pressures from those who are not happy with conservation objectives, and here I am referring to development interest and others.

"But when it comes to altering data, that is a serious matter. I am really sorry to hear that scientists working for the service feel they have to do that. Changing facts to fit the politics that is a very unhealthy thing. If I were a scientist in that position I would just refuse to do it."

The Union of Concerned Scientists and the public employee group provided copies of the survey and excerpts from essay-style responses.

One biologist based in California, who responded to the survey, said in an interview with The Times that the Fish and Wildlife Service was not interested in adding any species to the endangered species list.

"For biologists who do endangered species analysis, my experience is that the majority of them are ordered to reverse their conclusions [if they favor listing]. There are other biologists who will do it if you won't," said the biologist, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

© Copyright 2005 by TruthOut.org

---

## **NIH to Investigate Animal Cruelty Charges Against Ohio State University**

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has notified the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) that it will investigate charges by PCRM that Ohio State University has violated federal animal welfare regulations as part of its controversial Spinal Cord Injury Techniques Training Course.

The investigation comes in response to PCRM's complaints that OSU ignored federal regulations requiring government-funded research institutions using animals to "minimize pain and distress" "minimize the number of animals used," and to "consider non-animal alternatives."

Nicknamed "Cruelty 101," the OSU spinal injury techniques course requires students to surgically expose the spinal cords of mice and rats—a technique known as laminectomy—and drop weights on them to simulate human spinal cord injuries. Over the course of the three-week class, the 269 injured mice and rats are subjected to additional surgeries, invasive laboratory procedures, and physically demanding behavioral exercises before they are killed. The course is funded in part by NIH.

The university states that the class teaches a 'standardized' methodology for inflicting spinal cord damage.

"These procedures are as unnecessary as they are cruel," says Neal Barnard, M.D., president of the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. "Current spinal injury research using human neural cell lines, impact studies on human cadavers, and clinical trials, make the OSU course not only pointless, but redundant."

While rats and mice are not protected under the Animal Welfare Act, all laboratory animals are guaranteed some measure of protection under provisions of the Public Health Service Policy on the Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (PHS).

In 2002, PCRM was instrumental in stopping NIH-funded experiments by OSU researcher Dr. Michael Podell, who infected cats with feline immunodeficiency virus and injected them with methamphetamine ("speed") in an attempt to create an animal model for HIV-positive humans using drugs.

Ohio State University received a grant from the NIH's National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke to fund the spinal cord injury techniques course over five years. The next class is scheduled July 15-20, 2005. This will be the third year OSU has offered this course. University officials have so far refused to meet with PCRM and local humane organizations to discuss their concerns about the course.

Founded in 1985, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine is a nonprofit health organization that promotes preventive medicine, especially good nutrition. PCRM also conducts clinical research studies, opposes unethical human experimentation, and promotes alternatives to animal research.

---

## **New Virus May Have Come from Monkeys, Experts Say**

Reuters. 25 February 2005.

By Maggie Fox, Health and Science Correspondent

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Two new retroviruses never before seen in humans have turned up among people who regularly hunt monkeys in Cameroon, researchers reported on Friday.

Like the AIDS virus, these viruses insert their genetic material directly into cells and perhaps even into a person's or animal's chromosomes. Closely related versions of the viruses cause leukemia, inflammatory and neurological diseases. The two new viruses are called human T-lymphotropic virus types 3 and 4 or HTLV-3 and HTLV-4. They are closely related to two known viruses called HTLV-1 and HTLV-2, which experts believe were transmitted to people, like HIV, from monkeys and apes.

"Because HIV originated as a cross-species infection from a non-human primate virus, the question was how much cross-species retrovirus infections are occurring and what are the consequences of these infections," said Walid Hemeine of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, who led the study. They examined blood samples from 930 Cameroonians who had handled or eaten bush meat -- monkeys or apes hunted for food.

They used antibody screening and genetic analysis to find at least six different simian retroviruses had infected 13 of the people. "Two hunters were infected with two previously unknown HTLV viruses. One person was infected with HTLV-3, which is genetically similar to a simian virus, STLV-3, and represents

the first documented human infection with this virus," the researchers told the 12th Annual Retrovirus Conference being held in Boston.

"The second hunter was infected with HTLV-4, a virus distinct from all previously known human or simian T-lymphotropic viruses." "It's totally new so we don't know any other simian virus that is related to it," Hemeine said in a telephone interview. Now the team, which includes researchers at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, plans to look more extensively in Central Africa for the virus, Hemeine said. "They could be more widespread than we think they are," he said.

Hemeine said up to 25 million people globally are infected with HTLV-1 and 2. Currently, specialized tests are needed to find the viruses, he said. "It's a new virus. You pause, you say, where is this virus coming from. I don't think you should be taking it lightly," Hemeine said.

After infecting one person, simian viruses often spread from person to person through sex, mother-to-child transmission, and other exchanges of blood and body fluids. Like HIV, the incubation period for HTLV viruses to cause disease can last decades, the CDC said.

---

## **Animal Rights Advocacy Is a Growing Field**

More legal programs are offering classes for students interested in issues of pet cruelty, cosmetics testing and veterinary malpractice.

By Rachana Rathi

Times Staff Writer

February 25, 2005

Marissa Nuncio is passionate about your pet.

"Fighting for animal rights is as important as fighting for other social justice issues," said Nuncio, a second-year student at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles. "It's literally fighting for the underdog."

Nuncio and two of her like-minded classmates were preparing for a trip to Boston this weekend, where they will debate animal rights issues in a national moot court competition.

The event is the second of its kind held at Harvard Law School and reflects growing interest nationally in animal rights advocacy.

"The upcoming generation of lawyers takes this field seriously," said Sherri Woo, a second-year Loyola Law School student who volunteers for the Los Angeles city attorney's animal protection unit. "It shows that [animal rights] is growing and expanding and on its way to becoming an established area of law."

Topics of interest include animal testing for medical and cosmetic research, regulation of factory farms and veterinary malpractice.

Practitioners also see growth as traditional areas of the law expand to accommodate litigation involving pets, such as prohibitions on cruelty to animals, and pet owners who write pets into their wills and expect compensation in the event of injury or death of their animals.

In the last year, Loyola Law School, Chapman University School of Law and Massachusetts School of Law began offering an animal law course after students petitioned for it.

Of the more than 30 law schools that now offer a course in animal law, said professor William A. Reppy Jr. of Duke University School of Law, five benefited from grants from the Bob Barker Endowment Fund for the Study of Animal Rights Law. Barker has donated \$4 million to UCLA School of Law, Duke University School of Law, Columbia Law School and Stanford Law School.

"My whole object is to make it a better world for animals," said Barker, the longtime host of "The Price is Right." "To improve life for animals, we must have more stringent laws to protect them and more effectively enforce the laws already on the books."

With the \$1-million Barker endowment that Duke received in December, the law school will offer an animal law course and add an animal law clinic, allowing students to work on real cases, next January.

Students "love to get the practical experience," Reppy said. "They can go into court. It's the real world as opposed to the academic world."

At Harvard this weekend, the Animal Law Moot Court and Closing Argument Competitions serve similar purposes, said John Lovvorn, a judge at the competition and the vice president of animal protection litigation at the Humane Society of the United States.

"It's all part of a much larger push to give practical experience to law students in the field of animal law," said Lovvorn, who is an adjunct professor of animal law at George Washington University School of Law and Lewis & Clark Law School.

"In law school, they can get the basic theory of the law, but they need somewhere to go if they're actually going to practice this in the field," Lovvorn said. Few firms in the country focus on animal law, and most animal law cases are handled as pro bono work by large law firms specializing in other fields, Lovvorn said.

"You can't get a job in animal law," Reppy said. "The number of animal law jobs per year is no more than six or seven. I'm preparing my students to be ready for the opportunity [to volunteer] when it comes along."

Animal law is gaining prominence as more cases enter the judicial system. For instance, a Maine man was sentenced in December to five years in prison for killing his girlfriend's cat, the stiffest sentence for animal cruelty in Maine history, according to the Maine Animal Coalition.

"I'm actually teaching the law as it's forming. It also makes it difficult to teach because it's hard to define what it is. It's very fluid," said Cindy A. McNeely, who teaches at Florida State University College of Law.

Diane Sullivan, who created an animal law course at the Massachusetts School of Law last month, said the breadth of the topic also poses a challenge.

"It takes a tremendous amount of time to prepare for a course because when you teach animal law you have to take a look at the constitutional, property, criminal and tort issues," Sullivan said. "Students tell me this course is a great review of other areas of law."

Maya Morales, a second-year Loyola Law School student and member of the Student Animal Legal Defense Fund, said some "look down on animal law."

"People kind of feel like it's not real law because you're not dealing with people. It's not as respected as some other fields.

"On the other hand, there's not as many people speaking for animals and animal rights," Morales said.

For UCLA law student Cheryl Leahy, animal rights have been a lifelong passion, and she feels that she can make a difference through the law. "Everything in this field is new and cutting-edge. It's very exciting," said Leahy, president of the UCLA Animal Law Society. "It's something you have to be dedicated to, but it's absolutely worth the risk."

---

## **The secret life of moody cows**

Jonathan Leake, Science Editor

TimesOnline

February 27, 2005

ONCE they were a byword for mindless docility. But cows have a secret mental life in which they bear grudges, nurture friendships and become excited over intellectual challenges, scientists have found.

Cows are also capable of feeling strong emotions such as pain, fear and even anxiety — they worry about the future. But if farmers provide the right conditions, they can also feel great happiness.

The findings have emerged from studies of farm animals that have found similar traits in pigs, goats, chickens and other livestock. They suggest that such animals may be so emotionally similar to humans that welfare laws need to be rethought.

Christine Nicol, professor of animal welfare at Bristol University, said even chickens may have to be treated as individuals with needs and problems.

"Remarkable cognitive abilities and cultural innovations have been revealed," she said. "Our challenge is to teach others that every animal we intend to eat or use is a complex individual, and to adjust our farming culture accordingly."

Nicol will be presenting her findings to a scientific conference to be held in London next month by Compassion in World Farming, the animal welfare lobby group.

John Webster, professor of animal husbandry at Bristol, has just published a book on the topic, *Animal Welfare: Limping Towards Eden*. "People have assumed that intelligence is linked to the ability to suffer and that because animals have smaller brains they suffer less than humans. That is a pathetic piece of logic," he said.

Webster and his colleagues have documented how cows within a herd form smaller friendship groups of between two and four animals with whom they spend most of their time, often grooming and licking each other. They will also dislike other cows and can bear grudges for months or years.

Dairy cow herds can also be intensely sexual. Webster describes how the cows become excited when one of the herd comes into heat and start trying to mount her. "Cows look calm, but really they are gay nymphomaniacs," he said.

Donald Broom, professor of animal welfare at Cambridge University, who is presenting other research at the conference, will describe how cows can also become excited by solving intellectual challenges.

In one study, researchers challenged the animals with a task where they had to find how to open a door to get some food. An electroencephalograph was used to measure their brainwaves.

“Their brainwaves showed their excitement; their heartbeat went up and some even jumped into the air. We called it their Eureka moment,” said Broom.

The assumption that farm animals cannot suffer from conditions that would be considered intolerable for humans is partly based on the idea that they are less intelligent than people and have no “sense of self”.

Increasingly, however, research reveals this to be untrue. Keith Kendrick, professor of neurobiology at the Babraham Institute in Cambridge, has found that even sheep are far more complex than realised and can remember 50 ovine faces — even in profile. They can recognise another sheep after a year apart.

Kendrick has also described how sheep can form strong affections for particular humans, becoming depressed by long separations and greeting them enthusiastically even after three years.

The Compassion in World Farming conference will be opened with a keynote speech by Jane Goodall, the primatologist who founded the study of animal sentience with her research into chimpanzees in the early 1960s.

Goodall overturned the then accepted belief that animals were simply automatons showing little individuality or emotions. It has taken many years, however, for scientists to accept that such ideas could be applied to a wide range of other animals.

“Sentient animals have the capacity to experience pleasure and are motivated to seek it,” said Webster. “You only have to watch how cows and lambs both seek and enjoy pleasure when they lie with their heads raised to the sun on a perfect English summer’s day. Just like humans.”

---

## **QED: Animals make poor guinea pigs in drugs tests**

By Robert Matthews

[connected.telegraph.co.uk](http://connected.telegraph.co.uk)

In a world where dissent is frequently dealt with by summary execution, the injunction imposed last week by the High Court on anti-vivisection protestors in Oxford seems almost heart-warming.

Despite having been responsible for criminal damage, harassment and much disruption over recent months, activists have been told simply to stay away from those working on the animal testing centre being built in the city. Meanwhile, those who want to make their voices heard can still join the group of 50 allowed to protest from a spot provided by the university near the lab each Thursday afternoon between 1pm and 4pm. The injunction then requires that the protestors then disperse and head for a nominated teashop for pots of Darjeeling and muffins. All right, I made that last bit up, but I think the point is clear: there may be a lot wrong with this country, but dissent is still permitted - as long as we are reasonable about it. The trouble with the animal experimentation debate is that it drives people to be anything but reasonable. Even the most rational can be heard coming out with deeply dubious statements - such as claiming that animal experiments are vital to medical progress.

Distinguished professors of medicine fell over themselves last week hailing the injunction as crucial to their quest for miracle cures. Such unanimity usually implies that the claim being made is backed by plenty of compelling evidence. Certainly there is no shortage of treatments successfully tested on animals proving safe and effective with humans. Indeed, medical scientists routinely wheel them out - only to have them shot down by protestors pointing to equally anecdotal evidence of where animal experiments proved hopelessly misleading.

Recognising the futility of this ya-boo-sucks approach to scientific debate, the Royal Society issued a report earlier this year addressing the key issue: anecdotes apart, what does the scientific evidence tell us about the overall reliability of animals as surrogates for humans? According to the Royal Society, the evidence can be summed up thus: "Animals are normally highly accurate models for humans."

Again, one might expect such a definitive statement to be backed by a wealth of references to the scientific literature; after all, this is the Royal Society speaking, not some bloke in the pub, and as the report states: "The society believes in the importance of evidence-based discussion and debate."

Curiously, its statement is not supported by a single reference. This could, of course, be because the statement is so obviously correct that it no more needs references than does the declaration that the sky is blue.

Cynics will quickly point out another possibility, however: that there are no references because the evidence doesn't exist. Having made extensive efforts to find this evidence myself, I have reluctantly come to side with the cynics.

By chance, just a few weeks after the Royal Society published its report, the journal *Nature Drug Discovery* carried a review paper that considered the specific question of the predictive value of animals in toxicity testing of new drugs.

After trawling the literature, its authors concluded that the amount of data available was "limited" and "fragmentary". Even so, their overall conclusion was that if a drug is toxic in humans, animal tests will detect it around 70 per cent of the time. Missing around one in three toxic reactions to drugs hardly suggests animals are "highly accurate" surrogates for humans, but that misses a far more important point - and one overlooked by just about everyone working in this scientific Twilight Zone. A proper assessment of the accuracy of any predictive method, from weather forecasting to star charts, must take into account more than just its success rate. It must also include the false alarm rate - and studies show that this is astonishingly high in animal testing. The *Nature Drug Discovery* paper cites research showing that even with monkeys the false alarm rate exceeds the success rate in two-thirds of the forms of toxicity studied.

In other words, not only is there no evidence that animals are "highly accurate" surrogates for humans, but what data there is suggests their use is actually hampering medical progress, by falsely warning of toxic effects that simply don't affect humans.

Within pharmaceutical companies there is growing alarm about the signal failure of their "breakthroughs" to turn into successful money-spinning drugs. Over 90 per cent fail in tests before getting anywhere near the pharmacy shelves. There may be woefully little evidence about the value of animal testing, but what there is suggests that shareholders of drugs companies should be among those waving placards in Oxford on Thursday afternoons.

---

## **Commentary: When Medicine And Money Don't Mix**

Do drugmakers have too much control over lab data?

June 28, 2004

Businessweek Online

Science & Technology

GlaxoSmithKline PLC is the drugmaker in the hot seat this month. New York State Attorney General Eliot Spitzer sued the company on June 2, alleging that Glaxo fraudulently concealed data suggesting that its antidepressant Paxil might trigger suicidal thoughts and acts in kids under 18. British regulators, meanwhile, have been investigating whether Glaxo improperly withheld similar data on how the drug affects children. Glaxo says it has acted responsibly in conducting studies on pediatric patients and in disseminating that data. On June 14, Glaxo posted full pediatric study data on Paxil on its Web site.

The Paxil case, unfortunately, highlights a growing problem: Over the past two decades big drugmakers have exerted increasing control over medical research. Now they face broad criticism that they often spin the resulting data for commercial gain.

In some cases, drug companies downplay or delay the release of negative data. Critics also accuse drugmakers of designing their studies to improve the odds that their drugs will outshine competing products. And to spread the word, some pharma companies have hired consultants to write positive reviews of trials and paid doctors to sign on as authors.

Even the revered National Institutes of Health has drawn congressional scrutiny into financial ties between its researchers and companies. "The threat is to the objectivity of scientific research," says Sheldon Krimsky, a science policy expert at Tufts University and author of *Science in the Private Interest*. "It is reaching crisis proportions."

Pharmaceutical companies don't bury all unfavorable data. In early March, for example, Bristol-Myers Squibb announced that a study comparing its cholesterol-lowering drug to Pfizer's had shown the rival's product to be superior.

But such moves are all too rare. Take the case of the arthritis treatment Celebrex. A big product for Pharmacia in the 1990s, the drug is a \$3 billion blockbuster. It got a boost in 2000 when a trial showed that it was linked to fewer ulcers than two older nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). The problem was, Pharmacia's published data showed how patients fared after just six months, even though the company had gathered data for 12. The figures for the full year revealed less of a safety advantage for Celebrex -- and the Food & Drug Administration continues to require that Celebrex' label carry the same warning about stomach side effects as older NSAIDs.

A spokesman at Pfizer Inc. (PFE), which bought Pharmacia in 2003, says a committee of medical experts determined that the 6-month data was more meaningful because a large number of patients dropped out of the study at the half-year mark. In any case, he says, the full results were presented at scientific meetings. But critics argue that all that data should be publicized, so that doctors can reach their own conclusions. "The information prescribing physicians get on the safety and efficacy of drugs is grossly inadequate," contends Dr. Sidney Wolfe, director of the health research group at Ralph Nader's watchdog body, Public Citizen.

Yet even if all trial information is made public -- a step being pushed by a variety of groups, including the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors and the American Medical Assn. -- other problems will persist. That is because corporate funding now permeates most drug-related research. One Yale University study notes that in 1980, 32% of biomedical research and development in the U.S. was funded by industry. By 2000, the figure had soared to 62%.

As the industry has tightened its grip on research, the traditional emphasis on independence and ethics in medical science seems to have eroded. The Yale study found that in industry-funded research the odds are 3.6 times higher that the results will buttress the sponsor's product than in studies by independent groups such as the NIH and various foundations.

The reason: Drug companies can design trials in ways that give their products an edge. Dr. Cary P. Gross, assistant professor of medicine at the Yale School of Medicine, says drugmakers may, among other things, select dosages that are likely to show their product in a positive light.

### **Paid Endorsers**

Independent researchers are supposed to provide a counterbalance, thwarting the drug industry's tendency to turn research studies into marketing grist. But some drugmakers appear to have found ways around that. A lawsuit brought by a whistle-blower against Warner-Lambert in 1996 alleged that the company brought in consulting firms to "ghostwrite" articles on its epilepsy drug Neurontin, and then paid physicians to sign on as the authors. Pfizer, which bought Warner in 2000, agreed to pay \$430 million to settle a government suit triggered by the whistle-blower allegations. A spokesman for Pfizer says the company did not admit to the allegations in its settlement, and points out that all the activities at issue in the case occurred before Pfizer bought Warner.

It's impossible to know how prevalent ghostwriting is. But Dr. Drummond Rennie, professor of medicine at the University of California San Francisco and deputy editor of the Journal of the American Medical Assn., believes it is "pervasive, deceptive, and disgraceful."

In fact, Big Pharma's money and influence touch almost every corner of the medical industry. Consider that the NIH was compelled to set up a commission to look into conflicts of interest at the agency last February. An NIH spokesman now concedes that 118 employees at the Institutes have 196 ongoing consulting deals with corporations, primarily pharmaceutical and biotech companies.

So what's the right prescription for the questionable practices that have infected medical research? The first logical step is to establish a public registry that would carefully archive the results of all clinical trials. Drug companies have not supported such a move to date. And even if they bend, it won't be enough simply to disclose results as they are analyzed by the trial sponsors. Independent scientists -- enlisted by citizen groups, medical journals, or the government -- must have access to the raw data to ensure that conclusions are fair and accurate.

At the same time, the federal government should make more money available for follow-up trials on drugs that are already on the market. Such tests, uncontaminated by corporate funding, would provide valuable comparative data on how well drugs work -- especially in "off-label" treatments that don't involve FDA approval. Why bring in the government? Because drugmakers may resist doing expensive trials if they believe the drug may fare poorly.

The discouraging fact is that for many pharmaceutical companies, the current system is working beautifully. Few will acknowledge that major reforms are necessary. Of course, Wall Street analysts took exactly the same stance when they first came under legal fire. Big Pharma would do well to take their traumatic experiences to heart.

By Amy BarrettWith Kerry Capell in London and Susann Rutledge in New York

Copyright 2000-2004, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.

## **The New Abolitionism: Capitalism, Slavery and Animal Liberation**

By Dr. Steven Best

Capitalism originated in, and would have been impossible without, imperialism, colonization, the international slave trade, genocide, and large-scale environmental destruction. Organized around profit and power imperatives, capitalism is a system of slavery, exploitation, class hierarchy and inequality, violence, and forced labor. The Global Capitalist Gulag was fuelled, first, by the labor power of millions of slaves from Africa and other nations, and, second, by massive armies of immigrant and domestic workers who comprised an utterly new social class, the industrialized proletariat.

As Marx observed, the accumulation of wealth and the production of poverty, the aggrandizement of the ruling class and the immiseration of the ruled, the development of the European world and the underdevelopment of its colonies, are inseparably interrelated. These apparent antipodes are inevitable consequences of a grow-or-die, profit-seeking system of exploitation whose ceaseless expansion requires a slave class and inordinate amounts of cheap labor power.

The transatlantic slave trade began in 1444 when Henry the Navigator began taking Africans back to Portugal to serve as slaves. Africans already were enslaving each other, but their labor market was more akin to indentured servitude and nothing like the horrors they would later face in British America. Prior to trafficking in African slaves, European nations enjoyed positive relationships with Africa based on friendship and trade. This ended in the mid-fifteenth century when they were overtaken by insatiable demands for gold, profits, and slave labor. As evident in the brutal exploits of Columbus and Spain, many European states waged genocidal war against dark-skinned peoples in order to appropriate their land, resources, riches, and labor power.

Over the next few centuries European forces of “civilization,” “progress,” and Christianity kidnapped twenty million Africans from their homes and villages. They forced inland captives to march 500 grueling miles to the coast while barefoot and in leg irons. Half died before they reached the ships and more expired during the torturous six to ten week journey across the Atlantic to North America. The slave traders confined their human cargo to the suffocating hell beneath the deck. Blacks were packed into tight spaces, chained together, and delirious from heat, stench, and disease. They were beaten, force-fed, and thrown overboard in droves.

Marx rightly saw European colonialism as the “primitive stage of capital development” before the emergence of industrial society. From the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, profits from the slave trade built European economies, bankrolled the Industrial Revolution, and powered America before and after the Revolutionary War. The glorious cities and refined cultures of modern Europe were erected on the backs of millions of slaves, its “civilization” the product of barbarism. The horrors of slavery were the burning ethical and political issues of modern capitalism. Over a century after the liberation of blacks in the 1880s, however, slavery has again emerged as a focal point of debate and struggle, as society shifts from considering human to animal slaves and a new abolitionist movement seeking animal liberation emerges as a flashpoint for moral evolution and social transformation

### **Strange Fruit of American Democracy**

Both before and after the Revolutionary War, America was a slave-hungry system. In its European form, the nation emerged from scratch, with no prior feudal history or communal traditions, a product of British capital ventures. As British colonists found no gold like the Spaniards did in the Americas, they turned to agriculture. From the Indians they learned to grow tobacco as a profitable crop, but planting and harvesting required intense physical labor. For their sturdiness, vulnerability, and cheap price, the colonists favored Africans over Native American Indians and English laborers for the task.

The first Africans arrived on the North American continent in August 1619, a year before Pilgrims landed the Mayflower on the shores of Massachusetts and decades before the British slave trade began in New England. Exchanged for food, twenty blacks stepped off a Dutch slavery ship to become the first generation of African-Americans. Joining a society not yet lacerated by slavery and racism, they worked as indentured servants to British elites. As such, their status was equal to poor white servants, and servants of either race could gain freedom after their tenure. Like whites, blacks owned property, married, and voted in an integrated society.

This benign situation changed dramatically in the 1660s as ever-more Africans were brought to the colonies to meet the growing need for plantation labor. As slavery became crucial to capitalist expansion and plantation economies organized around tobacco, sugar, and cotton, British colonists constructed racist ideologies to legitimate the violent subjugation of those equal to them in the eyes of God and the principles of natural law. Having survived the shock of capture and wretchedness of their journey, African men, women, and children were auctioned, branded, and sold to white slave owners who grew rich from trading, breeding, and exploiting their bodies. With no consideration of blood ties or emotional bonds, black families were broken apart. Stripped of rights, dignity, and human status, these African citizens and their millions of American descendents were brutalized in the most vicious slavery system on the planet, one whose ugly legacy continues to dominate and poison the US.

As colonists became increasingly autonomous from the monarchy abroad, and British military occupation and oppression subsequently increased, the conflict between Empire and its unruly subjects – dramatized in events such as the Boston Tea Party in 1773 -- inexorably led to war. On July 4, 1776, the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence which asserted the “self-evident” truth that “all men are created equal” and “are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.” Along with progressive whites such as Thomas Paine and Abigail Adams, slaves were quick to denounce the hypocrisy whereby colonists such as Thomas Jefferson railed against British tyranny while owning slaves drawn from a system far more repressive than English monarchy.

Whereas many blacks fought for the British who promised them freedom, others fought courageously for the patriot cause and were crucial to its victory. When the war ended in 1783, social relations and racial views were in great flux. Tens of thousands of slaves fled to England, Canada, Spanish Florida, or Indian camps. Many Northern slaveholders who embraced the nation’s egalitarian values without regard to race freed their captives. In 1783, Massachusetts became the first state to abolish slavery and from 1789 to 1830 all states north of Maryland gradually followed suit. At the same time, however, slavery grew stronger roots in Southern states that were becoming increasingly influential economically and politically.

The new nation stood at a crucial moral crossroads regarding the slavery question and the true meaning of its professed democratic and Christian values. It could end slavery and adhere to its noble ideals, or it could perpetuate a vicious system of bondage to be an American hypocrisy not democracy. Tragically, the profit imperative triumphed over the moral imperative. Although the North continuously pandered to Southern slavery interests, the two cultures drifted apart irreconcilably like shifting tectonic plates. Rather than pulling together as one nation honoring the progressive values that led them to war, the US imploded through internal contradictions and in 1861 embarked on a bloody war with itself.

### **The Roar of Abolitionism**

With freedom denied and justice betrayed, both free and enslaved blacks intensified their resistance to white oppression. Increasingly, opponents of slavery turned from tactics of reform and moderation to demands for the total and immediate dismantling of the slavery system, and thus, in the 1830s, the abolitionist movement was born.

Abolitionism is rooted in a searing critique of racism and its dehumanizing effects on black people. In the US slavery market, a human being, on the basis of skin color alone, was declared biologically and naturally inferior to whites and thereby stripped of all rights. In such a system, the slave is transmogrified from a human subject into a physical object, from a person into a commodity, and thereby reduced to a moveable form of property known as “chattel.” Abolitionists viewed the institution of slavery as inherently evil, corrupt, and dehumanizing, such that no black person in bondage – however well-treated by their “masters” – could ever attain the full dignity, intelligence, and creativity of their humanity. Abolitionists renounced all reformist approaches that sought better or more “humane treatment” of slaves, in order to insist on the total emancipation of blacks from the chains, masters, laws, courts, and ideologies that corrupted, stunted, and profaned their humanity.

The most militant abolitionist voices advocated the use of violence as a necessary or legitimate tactic of struggle and self-defense. In 1829, David Walker published his “Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World,” a fiery eighty page pamphlet excoriating slavery and calling blacks to violent rebellion. Similarly, in his 1843 keynote address to the National Convention of Colored Citizens, Presbyterian minister Henry Highland Garnet enjoined the nation’s three million blacks to demand freedom and strike their oppressors down if necessary, for “there is not much hope of redemption without the shedding of blood.”

Along with the Haitian Revolution of August 22 1791, whereby black slaves violently overthrew Spanish and British occupiers to establish Haiti as a free black republic, such views panicked US slave owners over the possibility of slave revolts and violence. Their fears were justified, as blacks throughout the country were plotting and carrying out rebellions, achieving with bullets, machetes, or fire the justice denied to them in the courts. Whereas rebels such as Gabriel Prosser and Denmark Vesey were betrayed and executed before they could ignite large-scale insurrections, others like Nat Turner and John Brown (a white Christian) spilled the blood of many slave owners before being captured and executed by the state, and resurrected as folk heroes by the enemies of slavery.

Other influential voices urged militancy and direct action without violence. William Lloyd Garrison, a former indentured white servant, started a prominent abolitionist newsletter, the *Liberator*, on January 1, 1831, which he published for thirty five years. Against those urging slow, gradual, and moderate change, Garrison objected: “I do not wish to think, to speak, or write, with moderation ... Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen; but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present!”

Garrison also brought Frederick Douglass into the abolitionist movement. Douglass was born into slavery, became self-educated, and fled from bondage. With Garrison’s initial assistance, he became a star on the lecture circuit and in 1848 began publishing his own abolitionist newspaper, the *North Star*. In his electrifying speeches, Douglass preached a potent “gospel of struggle,” most eloquently expressed in an 1857 speech that exposed the Machiavellian essence of politics: “Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and never will ... The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that all concessions yet made to her august claims have been born of earnest struggle ... If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground, they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its waters.”

A vital part of the abolitionist movement was the Underground Railroad, a furtive, illegal network of volunteers – white and black, male and female, free person and slave – who violated pro-slavery laws in order to smuggle thousands of slaves into northern Free states and Canada. Harriet Tubman not only was a “passenger” on the railroad, using it to escape slavery in 1849 at age 25, she also became its celebrated “Conductor.” Risking jail or death, dodging slave hunters out for the \$40,000 bounty on her head, Tubman returned to Maryland numerous times to free family members and seventy other slaves. She epitomizes the courage, passion for freedom, and acute sense of justice driving the abolitionist movement.

After the Civil War ended in 1865, Congress passed the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, thereby banning slavery and mandating equal treatment for blacks and whites. By the late 1880s, blacks throughout the nation were formally “free,” but in reality they remained trapped in racist systems of violence, exploitation, and poverty. Despite advances during the brief Reconstruction Period, America reconstituted racist discrimination in frightful new ways. As the US became an apartheid system organized around Jim Crow segregation laws, violence against blacks increased dramatically through lynch mobs and the Ku Klux Klan. Not until the civil rights struggles of the 1950s and 1960s and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did brutality diminish, the walls of apartheid come down, and significant social progress become possible.

### **The New Abolitionism**

As black Americans and anti-racists continue to struggle for justice and equality, the moral and political spotlight is shifting to a far more ancient, pervasive, intensive, and violent form of slavery that confines, tortures, and kills animals by the billions in an ongoing global holocaust.

We speak of animal liberation no differently than human liberation. One cannot “enslave,” “dominate,” or “exploit” physical objects, nor can they be “freed,” “liberated,” or “emancipated.” These terms apply only to organic life forms that are sentient – to beings who can experience pleasure and pain, happiness or suffering. Quite apart from species differences and arbitrary attempts to privilege human powers of reason and language over the unique qualities of animal life, human and nonhuman animals share the same evolutionary capacities for joy or suffering, and in this respect they are essentially the same or equal.

Fundamentally, ethics demands that one not cause suffering to another being or impede another’s freedom and quality of life, unless there is some valid, compelling reason to do so (e.g., self-defense). For all the voluminous scientific literature on the complexity of animal emotions, intelligence, and social life, a being’s capacity for sentience is a necessary and sufficient condition for having basic rights.

Thus, just as animals can be enslaved, so too can they be liberated; indeed, where animals are enslaved, humans arguably have a duty to liberate them. Answering this call of conscience and duty, animal liberation groups have sprouted throughout the world with the objectives of freeing captive animals from systems of exploitation, attacking and dismantling the economic and material basis of oppression, and challenging the ancient mentality that animals exist as human resources, property, or and chattel.

Stealing blacks from their native environment and homeland, wrapping chains around their bodies, shipping them in cramped quarters across continents for weeks or months with no regard for their suffering, branding their skin with a hot iron to mark them as property, auctioning them as servants, separating family members who scream in anguish, breeding them for service and labor, exploiting them for profit, beating them in rages of hatred and anger, and killing them in huge numbers – all these horrors and countless others inflicted on black slaves began with the exploitation of animals. Advanced by technology and propelled by capitalist profit imperatives, the unspeakably violent violation of animals’ emotions, minds, and bodies continues today with the torture and killing of billions of individuals in fur farms, factory farms, slaughterhouses, research laboratories, and other nightmarish settings.

It is time no longer just to question the crime of treating a black person, Jew, or any other human victim of violence “like an animal”; rather, we must also scrutinize the unquestioned assumption that it is acceptable to exploit and terrorize animals.

Whereas the racist mindset creates a hierarchy of superior/inferior on the basis of skin color, the speciesist mindset demeans and objectifies animals by dichotomizing the evolutionary continuum into human and nonhuman life. As racism stems from a hateful white supremacism, so speciesism draws from

a violent human supremacism, namely, the arrogant belief that humans have a natural or God-given right to use animals for any purpose they devise.

Both racism and speciesism serve as legitimating ideologies for slavery economies. After the civil war, the Cotton Economy became the Cattle Economy as the nation moved westward, slaughtered millions of Indians and sixty million buffalo, and began intensive operations to raise and slaughter cattle for food. Throughout the twentieth century, as the US shifted from a plant-based to a meat-based diet, meat and dairy industries became giant economic forces. In the last few decades, pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies have become major components of global capitalist networks, and their research and testing operations are rooted in the breeding, exploitation, and killing of millions of laboratory animals each year

Of course, as soon as Homo erectus began making tools nearly three million years ago, hominids have killed and appropriated animals for labor power, food, clothing, and innumerable other resources, and animal exploitation has been crucial to human economies. But whatever legitimate reasons humans had for using animals to survive in past hunting and gathering societies, subsistence economies, and other low-tech cultures, these rationales are now obsolete in a modern world rife with alternatives to using animals for food, clothing, and medical research. Furthermore, however important the exploitation of animals might be to modern economies, utilitarian apologies for enslaving animals are as invalid as arguments used to justify human slavery or experimentation on human beings at Auschwitz or Tuskegee. Rights trump utilitarian appeals; their very function is to protect individuals from being appropriated for someone else's or a "greater good."

### **The Subterfuge of Welfarism**

It was not uncommon for a racist to argue that slavery was beneficial for blacks or that they were biologically unfit for freedom. Similarly, factory farm managers claim that pigs, calves, and chickens are better off in conditions of intense confinement rather than in their natural habitat as their "needs are met" in "managed environments." Zookeepers and circus operators assert that their animals live better in confinement than in the wild where they are subject to poachers and other dangers.

Abolitionists attack welfarism as a dangerous ruse and roadblock to moral progress, and ground their position in the logic of rights. 19th century abolitionists were not addressing the slave master's "obligation" to be kind to the slaves, to feed and clothe them well, or to work them with adequate rest. Rather, they demanded the total and unqualified eradication of the master-slave relation, the freeing of the slave from all forms of bondage.

Similarly, the new abolitionists reject reforms of the institutions and practices of animal slavery as grossly inadequate and they pursue the complete emancipation of animals from all forms of human exploitation, subjugation, and domination. They seek not bigger cages, but rather empty cages.

To treat black slaves humanely is a contradiction in terms because the institution of slavery inherently is anti-human and dehumanizing. Similarly, one cannot logically be "kind" to animals kept in debilitating confinement against their will. To "act responsibly" to animals in such a situation requires one liberate them from it. Talk of "humane killing" of animals is especially absurd as there is no "humane" way to steal and violate an animal's life, and subject it to continual pain and suffering. No accurately aimed bolt shot through the head of an animal warrants pretense to any kind of moral dignity, however superior the killing method is to dismemberment of an animal in a conscious state. Killing itself – unnecessary and unjustified – is inhumane and wrong.

While thousands of national and grass-roots animal welfare organizations help animals in countless ways and reduce their suffering, they cannot free them from exploitation. Welfarists never challenge the

legitimacy of institutions of oppression and they share with animal exploiters the speciesist belief that humans have a right to use animals as resources as long as they act “responsibly.” Moral progress and animal liberation is premised on making the profound shift from human responsibility to animals to the rights of animals.

The true obstacles to moral progress are not the sociopaths who burn cats alive, for they are an extreme minority whose actions are almost universally condemned as barbaric. The real barrier to animal liberation is the welfarist orientation and its language of “humane care,” “responsible treatment,” and “kindness and respect.” Every institution of animal exploitation – including the fur farm and slaughterhouse industries -- speaks this language, and animals in their “care” are routinely tortured in horrific ways. Animal welfarism is insidious. It lulls people into thinking that animals in captivity are healthy and content. It promotes human supremacy and tries to dress up the fundamental wrong of exploiting animals in the illusory language of “kind,” “respectful,” and “humane treatment.” Attempting to mask and sanitize the evil of oppression, animal welfarism perverts language, corrupts meaning, and is fundamentally Orwellian and deceptive.

Furthermore, by trying to hijack and monopolize the discourse of moral responsibility solely for its own purposes as it feigns ethical behavior, animal welfarism strategically positions animal rights discourse of any kind – because of the premise that animals are not our resources to use – as extreme. And if an animal rights advocate or organization transgresses conservative decorum or legal boundaries in any way, welfarists denounce the tactics as “violent” and “terrorist,” as measures that “discredit” an otherwise respectable concern for animal welfare.

### **In Defense of Direct Action**

Although abolitionism is rooted in the logic of rights, not welfarism, there are problems with some animal rights positions that also must be overcome. First, as emphasized by Gary Francione, many individuals and organizations that champion animal rights in fact are “new welfarists” who speak in terms of rights but in practice seek welfare reforms and thereby seek to ameliorate, not abolish, oppression. While Francione underplays the complex relationship between welfare and rights, reform and abolition, he illuminates the problem of obscuring fundamental differences between welfare and rights approaches and he correctly insists on the need for uncompromising abolitionist campaigns.

Francione, however, is symptomatic of a second problem with animal rights “legalists” who buy into the status quo’s self-serving argument that the only viable and ethically acceptable tactics for a moral or political cause are those the state pre-approves and sanctions. In rejecting the militant direct action tactics that played crucial roles throughout the struggles to end both human and animal slavery, Francione and others use the same rationale animal welfarists employ against them. Mirroring welfare critiques of rights, and serving as a mouthpiece for the state and animal exploitation industries, Francione criticizes direct activists as radical, extreme, and damaging to the moral credibility and advancement of the cause.

Like its predecessor, the new abolitionist movement is diverse in its philosophy and tactics, ranging from legal to illegal approaches and pacifist to violent orientations. A paradigmatic example of the new abolitionism is the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). ALF activists pursue two different types of tactics against animal exploiters. First, they use sabotage or property destruction to strike at their economic heart and make it less profitable or impossible to use animals. The ALF insists that its methods are non-violent because they only attack the property of animal exploiters, and never the exploiters themselves. They thereby eschew the violence espoused by Walker and Garnet. The ALF argues that the real violence is what is done to animals in the name of research or profit. Second, in direct and immediate acts of liberation, the ALF breaks into prison compounds to release or rescue animals from their cages. They are not “stealing” animals, because they are not property and anyone’s to own in the first place; rather, they are liberating them. By providing veterinary treatment and homes for many of the animals they liberate, using an extensive underground network of care and home providers, the ALF is a superb contemporary example of the Underground Railroad that funneled black slaves to freedom.

The new abolitionism also is evident in the work of “open rescue” groups like Compassion Over Killing who liberate animals from factory farms without causing property destruction or hiding behind masks of anonymity. Moreover, ethical vegans who boycott all animal products for the principle reason that it is wrong to use or kill animals as food resources, however “free-range” or “humanely” produced or killed, abolish cruelty from their lives and contribute toward eliminating animal exploitation altogether.

As of yet, there are no active Nat Turners and John Browns in the animal liberation movement, but they may be forthcoming and would not be without just cause for their actions. Nor would they be without precedent. According to the gospel of struggle: No justice, no peace.

### **The Meaning of Moral Progress**

Just as nineteenth century abolitionists sought to awaken people to the greatest moral issue of the day, so the new abolitionists of the 21st century endeavor to enlighten people about the enormity and importance of animal suffering and oppression. As black slavery earlier raised fundamental questions about the meaning of American “democracy” and modern values, so current discussion regarding animal slavery provokes critical examination into a human psyche damaged by violence, arrogance, and alienation, and the urgent need for a new ethics and sensibility rooted in respect for all life.

Animal liberation is not an alien concept to modern culture; rather it builds on the most progressive ethical and political values Westerners have devised in the last two hundred years --those of equality, democracy, and rights – as it carries them to their logical conclusion. Whereas ethicists such as Arthur Kaplan argue that rights are cheapened when extended to animals, it is far more accurate to see this move as the redemption of rights from an arbitrary and prejudicial limitation of their true meaning.

The next great step in moral evolution is to abolish the last acceptable form of slavery that subjugates the vast majority of species on this planet to the violent whim of one. Moral advance today involves sending human supremacy to the same refuse bin that society earlier discarded much male supremacy and white supremacy. Animal liberation requires that people transcend the complacent boundaries of humanism in order to make a qualitative leap in ethical consideration, thereby moving the moral bar from reason and language to sentience and subjectivity.

Animal liberation is the culmination of a vast historical learning process whereby human beings gradually realize that arguments justifying hierarchy, inequality, and discrimination of any kind are arbitrary, baseless, and fallacious. Moral progress occurs in the process of demystifying and deconstructing all myths -- from ancient patriarchy and the divine right of kings to Social Darwinism and speciesism -- that attempt to legitimate the domination of one group over another. Moral progress advances through the dynamic of replacing hierarchical visions with egalitarian visions and developing a broader and more inclusive ethical community. Having recognized the illogical and unjustifiable rationales used to oppress blacks, women, and other disadvantaged groups, society is beginning to grasp that speciesism is another unsubstantiated form of oppression and discrimination.

Building on the momentum, consciousness, and achievements of past abolitionists and suffragettes, the struggle of the new abolitionists might conceivably culminate in a Bill of (Animal) Rights. This would involve a constitutional amendment that bans exploitation of animals and discrimination based on species, recognizes animals as “persons in a substantive sense, and grants them the rights relevant and necessary to their existence – the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In 2002, Germany took the crucial first step in this direction by adding the words “and animals” to a clause in its constitution obliging the state to protect the dignity of humans.

If capitalism is a grow-or-die system based on slavery and exploitation – be it imperialism and colonialism, exploitation of workers, unequal pay based on gender, or the oppression of animals – then it is a system

a movement for radical democracy must transcend, not amend. But just as black slaves condemned the hypocrisy of colonists decrying British tyranny, and suffragettes exposed the contradiction of the US fighting for democracy abroad during World War I while denying it to half of their citizenry at home, so any future movement for peace, justice, democracy, and rights that fails to militate for the liberation of animals is as inconsistent as it is incomplete.